

VU Research Portal

"The Port-Royal Grammar. A bibliographical note"

Noordegraaf, J.

published in

Historiographia Linguistica

1982

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1075/hl.9.1-2.17noo](https://doi.org/10.1075/hl.9.1-2.17noo)

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Noordegraaf, J. (1982). "The Port-Royal Grammar. A bibliographical note". *Historiographia Linguistica*, 9, 169-173. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hl.9.1-2.17noo>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

THE PORT-ROYAL GRAMMAR A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

JAN NOORDEGRAAF
Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

0. In an article on the Port-Royal Grammar Brekle (1975) made some bibliographical and critical remarks on recent editions of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* (henceforth *GGR*).^{*} His discussion included the translations of the *GGR*, though it confined itself to one English and one Italian translation dating from 1753 and 1969 respectively. As a complement to his informative review article I was able to point out that a Dutch translation had appeared as early as 1740. Its translator, Johanna Corleva, had based her work on the *GGR* edition published in Amsterdam in 1703 (cf. Noordegraaf 1978: 195).

In his article Brekle refuted Mathiesen's (1970: 128) claim that this Amsterdam edition (henceforth A 1703) gives the same text as the 1676 Paris edition. He demonstrated convincingly that A 1703 followed the text of the second edition of the *GGR* (Paris 1664).

In 1676 another edition of the *GGR* was published in Brussels (= B 1676); this edition, too, appeared to follow the text of the Paris edition of 1664 (= P 1664). The question Brekle raised was this: was A 1703 based on P 1664 directly or indirectly, via B 1676? His conclusion was 'that B 1676 served as a model for A 1703' (Brekle 1975: 226). He considered a direct relation between P 1664 and A 1703 as 'a possible, though less plausible, alternative to the dependence of A 1703 on B 1676' (227). My recent acquisition of a copy of P 1664 was an occasion for me to take a closer look at the question raised by Brekle. [170]

1. I agree with Brekle's conclusion that both B 1676 and A 1703 follow the text of P 1664. The question can therefore be reformulated as follows: when the Dutch printer was type-setting the Amsterdam edition, of which edition did he use a copy?¹

In spite of his 'painstaking search through B 1676 and A 1703' Brekle could only find a few variants which seemed to indicate 'that B 1676 served as a model for A 1703' (Brekle 1975: 225-26). When I checked the variants listed by Brekle in two copies of P 1664 that were available to me, it turned out that a number of these variants did not occur in my material.² To quote one example, according to Brekle (1975: 226) we read in P 1664 in the list of the 'Temps du Verbe avoir': *Preterit parfait simple*, whereas B 1676 and A 1703 simply read: *Preterit parfait*. According to my sources P 1664: 136, B 1676: 115, and A 1703: 138 all have *Preterit parfait simple*.³

Furthermore there are numerous other differences between the texts of B 1676 and A 1703 besides those listed by Brekle, most of which can be regarded as matters simply concerning spelling. For one particular reason I would rather not discuss these: the Amsterdam publisher Estienne Roger was a native speaker of French and did not hesitate to alter the text by inserting a whole new paragraph (cf. Brekle 1975: 227).

^{*}) I would like to thank Ton Vendel for his indispensable help in preparing the final version of this text.

Brekle's own remark of being able to give 'only a thin thread of evidence' added to my inability to find in my own material some of the variants that he cites, prompted the notion that in a case such as this the method used by Brekle — comparing only the texts themselves — could not lead to a definitive answer. I would like to suggest another way by which one can arrive at the conclusion that Estienne Roger has used a copy of P 1664 as *Vorlage* when he 'a fait faire cette édition' (A 1703: 160), and that it wasn't a copy of B 1676 that served as a model for his edition.

2. When a copy of P 1664 is put side by side with copies of both B 1676 and A 1703, it is at once noticeable that the Dutch compositor has arranged the text on the pages in the same way as it had been done in the *Paris* edition. A 1703 and P 1664 have the 'Preface' on page 5 and 3 respectively, while B 1676 has it on page 3; but the 'Avertissement' is on page 159 in A 1703 and on page 157 in P 1664, whereas B 1676 has it on pages 133-34.⁴

In short: the division of the text over the pages in the Amsterdam edition runs parallel to that in the *Paris* edition, while the B 1676 edition is quite different in this respect. When one has a copy of both editions at one's disposal, one can easily determine that every page in A 1703 has an amount of text [171] equal to the corresponding page in P 1664. Very often the texts agree line for line and even where the line-endings are sometimes dissimilar, the texts are brought to agreement at the end of each page.⁵

According to the bibliographical handbooks this is 'proof enough that one copy is a resetting of the other' (Padwick 1969: 114; cf. McKerrow 1967: 187), and that means in any case that the compositor of A 1703 has used a copy of P 1664 as his model. The possibility that, while following the text of B 1676, as Brekle assumes, the Dutch compositor came to the same division of that text as his *Paris* colleague almost forty years earlier, must be excluded. No two compositors would achieve such a parallel result throughout the length of a book (cf. Padwick 1969: 114).

Beside the same division of the text there are also a number of differences in the diagrams to indicate that A 1703 bases itself on the *Paris* model (see, e.g., P 1664: 61, A 1703: 63 and B 1676: 52). Also instructive is the way in which the contents of some chapters are presented. To cite one example: the content of 'chapitre XVIII' is distributed over the lines in the following way in both A 1703: 119 and P 1664: 117: *Des Verbes qu'on peut appeller Adjectifs, // & de leurs différentes especes: Actifs, // Passifs, Neutres. //*. But in B 1676: 99 the distribution is: *Des Verbes qu'on peut appeller Adjectifs, & de leurs // différentes especes: Actifs, Passifs, Neutres. //*.

3. When two editions of the same work have the same division of the text over the page, these editions are in some way related. Brekle has not taken into account this principle, which appears to me something like a bibliographical axiom. Therefore his *stemma*, indicating the genetic relationship between the editions of the GGR that were published between 1660 and 1703, needs to be slightly modified (cf. Brekle 1975: 228). A 1703 is based directly on P 1664, without any dependence on B 1676.

It is hoped that, with the evidence presented above, one of the minor questions concerning the textual relationships between some editions of the GGR has been settled. It certainly wasn't the last problem. As Donzé (1971: 35) once put it: 'L'histoire de la grammaire générale reste à faire'.⁶

[172]

NOTES

- 1) It seems to me highly unlikely that the Dutch printer based his work on a manuscript copy.
- 2) Apart from my own copy, which is bound in one volume with the *Nouvelle Methode pour apprendre ... la langue italienne* and the *Nouvelle Methode pour apprendre ... la langue espagnole*, I used the copy at the library of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (sign. XH 05671).
- 3) A second example: in the *Table des titres et chapitres* P 1676 as well as A 1703 read ‘... pour apprendre à lire ...’, whereas B 1676 prints: ‘... pour prendre à lire ..’, according to Brekle (1975: 227). According to my material, however, both P 1664 and B 1676 have: ‘... pour apprendre à lire ...’, whereas A 1703 gives: ‘... pour apprendre à lire ...’. It is possible, though, that there are variant copies of one single edition. In this connection I think of ‘made-up copies’, composed of sheets of different editions.
- 4) It is not relevant here that both P 1664 and B 1676 are in octavo whereas A 1703 is in duodecimo. Duodecimo seems to have been a current format for French language books that were printed in the Netherlands in the early 18th century .
- 5) A random page in A 1703, p. 50, starts with ‘On se sert’ and ends with ‘Utile à la Republique’. The corresponding page in P 1664, p. 48, also starts with ‘On se sert’ and ends with ‘Utile à la Republique’. Half the line-endings are different. This particular piece of text can be found on part of page 41 in B 1676. The parallelism is, of course, interrupted by Roger’s apocryphal passage (cf. A 1703:108 and P 1664: 106). By A 1703: 119 (= P 1664: 117), however, they have come into line again.
- 6) Estienne Roger, who announces himself on the title page as ‘Marchand Libraire, chez qui l’on trouve un assortiment général de toute sorte de Musique’, includes a seventeen-page ‘Catalogue’ after the ‘Table des titres et chapitres’ (A 1703: 161-63). It mainly concerns ‘Des Livres de Musique nouvellement imprimez à Amsterdam chez Estienne Roger, ... *Et qui se vendent à Londres, chez François & Paul Vaillant, Libraires dans le Strand*’. Dr Bert van Selm of the University of Leiden pointed out to me that this reference to London could mean that Roger’s edition was also aimed at the English market.

[173]

REFERENCES

- [Arnauld, Antoine (1612-94) & Claude Lancelot (1615?-95)]. 1664. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, ... Paris: Pierre le Petit. [= P 1664]
- . 1676, *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, ... Bruxelles: E. H. Fricx. (Repr., Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1973.) [= B 1676]
- . 1703. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, ... Amsterdam: E. Roger. [= A 1703]
- Brekle, Herbert E. 1975. ‘The Port-Royal Grammar: Some bibliographical and critical notes on recent editions’. *HL* 2.223-31.

- Donzé, Roland. 1971. *La Grammaire générale et raisonnée de Port-Royal*. 2nd ed. Berne: Francke.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. 1967. *An Introduction to Bibliography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Repr. of the second impression, 1928.)
- Mathiesen, Robert. 1970. [Review of various editions of the GGR]. *Lg* 46. 126-30.
- Noordegraaf, Jan. 1978. 'Linguistica Neerlandica: A Dutch translation of the Port-Royal Grammar'. *HL* 5.193-96.
- Padwick, E. W. 1969. *Bibliographical Method: An introductory survey*. Cambridge & London: Clarke & Co.

Addendum 2007

- Mertens, Franz-Jozef & Swiggers, Pierre. 1983. 'La Grammaire générale et raisonnée de Port-Royal: Notes bibliographiques'. *HL* 10.357-362.

